REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 16, 2004.

Currently, claims 1-19 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 12 and cancelled claims 3, 9, 10, 16, and 17. Applicant respectfully submits that the present amendments put the application in condition for allowance and accordingly, respectfully request entry thereof.

I. Summary of Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-15, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,473,621 ("*Heie*").

Claims 3, 9, and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heie* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,804,803 ("*Cargun.*").

II. Summary of Claim Objections

Claims 10 and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

III. Applicant's Response

The Examiner indicated that claims 10 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

During an interview on February 15, 2005, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed incorporating the limitations of claims 10 and 17, including the intervening claims, into each independent claim. The Examiner indicated that he had no objection to this so long as the material limitations of independent claims 1 and 4 relating to the allowable subject matter were substantially of the same scope as that of independent claims 5 and 12.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 4, 5, and 12 are patentable over the cited art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a) because they include the limitations which the Examiner indicated would render the claims allowable. Claims 2, 6-8, 11,

13-15, and 18-19 each ultimately depend from one of claims 1, 4, 5, and 12 and therefore, should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

IV. Notice of Appeal

A Notice of Appeal is being filed concurrently with this response. The Notice is only being filed to preserve Applicant's rights and avoid abandonment should the Examiner not agree that the present application is in condition for allowance after entry of these amendments.

V. Interview Summary

An interview between Examiner Michael Young Won and Applicant's representative David E. Cromer was conducted on February 15, 2005.

No prior art was discussed.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 16, and 17 were discussed.

Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed incorporating the limitations of claims 10 and 17, including any intervening claims, into each independent claim of the application. The Examiner indicated that this was acceptable as long as the material limitations of claims 1 and 4 relating to the allowable subject matter were substantially of the same scope as that of claims 5 and 12.

The Examiner agreed that if he had any objection to the claims after Applicant filed the present response or otherwise did not agree that the Application was in condition for allowance, he would contact Applicant's representative to discuss and remedy the objections rather than issue a notice of abandonment.

VI. Domestic Priority Claims

As indicated by the amendment in Applicant's response dated May 17, 2004, the present application is a "continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application entitled TRANSFERRING E-MAIL ATTACHEMENTS TO DEVICES FOR RENDERING, U.S. Application Serial No. 09/652,761, filed on August 31, 2000, now U.S. Patent no. 6,360,252."

As also indicated by that amendment, the present application also "claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/155,024, filed on September 20, 1999, entitled

METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROVIDING MOBILE ACCESS TO COMPUTER NETWORKS."

Accordingly, the proper priority data for this application should reflect that the application is a continuation in part of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/652,761 (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,252) **AND** claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/155,024.

However, the data on the updated filing receipt and reflected in the PAIR system recites that the present application is a continuation in part of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/652,761 **WHICH** claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/155,024.

While it is true that U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/652,761 claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/155,024, the priority data at the USPTO does not accurately reflect and recognize that the present application directly claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/155,024.

The proper priority data for this application should reflect that the application is a continuation in part of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/652,761 (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,252) **AND** claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/155,024.

The Examiner's cooperation and assistance in recognizing and correcting the priority data for the present application is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-15, and 18-19 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, February 16, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 16, 2005

By: _____
David E. Cromer
Reg. No. 54,768

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 Market Street, Suite 540
San Francisco, California 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665